

Appl. No. 09/884,925  
Amdt. dated April 28, 2006  
Reply to Office action of February 21, 2006

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Two different RCEs filed on December 13, 2005 and December 16, 2005:

**Response:**

5 The RCE filed on December 16, 2005 is the RCE that the applicant wishes to use to further the prosecution of this application. The claim amendments included in this paper are with respect to the claim amendments of the RCE filed on December 16, 2005.

2. Objections to the claims:

10 Claims 15, 20, 28, and 34 are objected to due to informalities.

**Response:**

The applicant has amended claims 15, 20, 28, and 34 to overcome these claim objections. Acceptance of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

15

3. Rejection of claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph:

Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

20

**Response:**

Claim 34 has been amended to overcome this rejection. The applicant has removed the phrase "in this case" from claim 34 to remove all indefinite claim language. Reconsideration of the currently amended claim 34 is respectfully requested.

25

4. Rejection of claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph:

Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with

Appl. No. 09/884,925  
Amdt. dated April 28, 2006  
Reply to Office action of February 21, 2006

the written description requirement. Applicant claims that the multimedia data file consists of generated image and sound of said object at each time frame. This limitation cannot be found anywhere in the specification, thus, this subject matter constitutes new matter.

5

**Response:**

Claim 34 has been amended to overcome this rejection. The applicant has removed the phrase "at each time frame" from claim 34 to remove all new matter that was previously added. Reconsideration of the currently amended claim 34 is respectfully requested.

10

5. Rejection of claims 15-17, 28, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e):

Claims 15-17, 28, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hashimoto et al. (US 6,111,604).

15

**Response:**

Independent claims 15 and 28 have been amended to overcome this rejection. Claim 15 now specifies that the processor analyzes the second digital signals to determine if the second digital signals match the voice of a predetermined user. Furthermore, claim 15 recites that a single multimedia data file including digital image and sound information is produced for the personal computer when the second digital signals match the voice of the predetermined user. With such an arrangement, the user of the multimedia data file producer can use voice control to start the operation of the multimedia data file producer. This claim amendment is supported on page 7, lines 6-10 of the specification, and in Figure 3. No new matter is added through this amendment to claim 15.

20

25

On the other hand, Hashimoto does not teach analyzing sound signals to determine if the sound signals match the voice of a user, and controlling the production of a single

Appl. No. 09/884,925  
Amdt. dated April 28, 2006  
Reply to Office action of February 21, 2006

multimedia data file containing digital image and sound information when the sound signals match the voice of the user. Therefore, Hashimoto does not anticipate all of the limitations of the currently amended claim 15. Reconsideration of claim 15 is therefore respectfully requested.

5

Claim 28 has been amended similar to the amendment to claim 15. Claim 28 recites that a signal processor analyzes the sound digital signal to determine if the sound digital signal matches the voice of a predetermined user, and the multiplexer combines the image digital signal and the sound digital signal when the sound digital signal matches the voice of the predetermined user. The signal processor is supported by the DSP 242 shown in Figure 2, and described on page 6, lines 10-18. Furthermore, the voice control limitations are supported on page 7, lines 6-10 of the specification and in Figure 3. No new matter is added through this amendment to claim 28.

As explained above, Hashimoto does not teach analyzing sound signals to determine if the sound signals match the voice of a user, and controlling the combining of image digital signals and sound digital signals when the sound signals match the voice of the user. Therefore, Hashimoto does not anticipate all of the limitations of the currently amended claim 28. Reconsideration of claim 28 is therefore respectfully requested.


20

Claims 16-21 and 29-34 are dependent on claims 15 and 28, respectively, and should be allowed if claims 15 and 28 are allowed. Reconsideration of claims 15-21 and 28-34 is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Appl. No. 09/884,925  
Amdt. dated April 28, 2006  
Reply to Office action of February 21, 2006

Sincerely yours,



Date: 04.28.2006

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

- 10 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)